UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,063	06/24/2003	Christian Jacquemot	SUN-P5871	1576

29989 7590 06/28/2007

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER
ROMANO, JOHN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/606,063	JACQUEMOT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John J. Romano	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 June 2003 and 17 November 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **1-39** are pending in this action.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The Applicant is requested to update the specification's recitation of patent application with the now corresponding patent number (i.e., See page 1, line 8, "corresponding US 2002/0007468 A1", page 4, lines 31 + 33, page 6, etc...).

The specification recites "...exhibits are may be..." (See page 4, line 22).

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (i.e., See page 5, line 8, 12, 15, 22 and 27). See MPEP § 608.01.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claim **26** is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim **26** refers to "remove management". For the sake of compact resolution the examiner is interpreting

Claim **26** to read "remote management". Thus, the striking of ~~remove~~ and inserting remote is believed appropriate. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims **1, 6, 7, 9** and **15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim **1** recites the limitation "said second subset" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim **6** recites the limitation "said plurality of interfaces" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim **7** recites the limitation "said first set of data" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim **9** recites the limitation "said plurality of generic entities" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The terms "downstream" and "sense" in claim **15** are relative terms which renders the claims indefinite. The terms "downstream" and "sense" are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Accordingly, it is unclear what applicant means by the limitation

"...and nevertheless finding an attribute value downstream in the sense: interaction, component, software load, configuration value for entering an error processing mode". For the sake of compact examination, the examiner is interpreting the above, quoted limitation to mean invoking an error processing mode upon an event.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims **1-29 and 35-39,** are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent system claim **1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 is directed to groups of "data" in a "software language". Therefore, the claimed system is interpreted as an arrangement of data per se lacking the necessary hardware to permit the functionality to be realized. As such, the system is directed to non-statutory subject matter and is therefore, rejected. To overcome this type of rejection the claims need to be amended to comprise statutory subject matter (i.e., computer readable medium encoded with a data structure defining structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized). See MPEP 2106.01 (I). Appropriate correction is required.

Accordingly, claims **2-29** are rejected for not further limiting to cure the deficiencies addressed above in the rejected base claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Independent claim **35** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed term "computer readable medium" which is defined in the specification as both storage medium "as well as a transmission medium such as a digital or analog signal" (See specification, page 60, lines 30-32) is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A product is a tangible physical article or object, some form of matter, which a signal is not. A signal, a form of energy, does not fall within either of the two definitions of manufacture. Thus a signal does not fall within any of the four statutory classes of 101. See Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, Annex IV (c), (signed 26, October, 2005) – OG Cite: 1300 OG 142. Retrieve on <http://www.upsto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/og/2005/week47/patgupa.htm>.

Additionally, a program product with recordable medium is not necessary yet to be a computer readable medium and recorded/stored with executable instructions.

Accordingly, claims **36-39** are rejected for not further limiting to cure the deficiencies addressed above in the rejected base claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims **1, 2, 4, 5, 8-15, 17-21, 23-38** and **39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belfiore et al., US 6,990,513 (hereinafter **Belfiore**).

In regard to claim **1**, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "*A computer system comprising: a plurality of groups of data in a common software language* ..." (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 26, lines 54-67), wherein XML messaging encapsulating metadata and payload is taught.
- "*...wherein each group of data comprises; a first group of data modeling a plurality of components and a plurality of interactions between said plurality of components...*" (E.g., see Figure 1 (175) & Column 41, lines 3-7), wherein the code management abstracts the components and interactions between operating components.
- "*...a second group of data modeling a software load of said plurality of components and said plurality of interactions between said plurality of components...*" (E.g., see Figure 13 (1400) & Column 41, lines 38-42),

wherein the manifest 1400 is a superset of information for making its associated software usable in one or more computing environments.

- "*...a first software code interacting with said plurality of groups of data for qualifying said second subset of data as defining a ... combination of said plurality of components.*" (E.g., see Figure 1 & Column 43, lines 29-40), wherein the installer module downloads the manifest associated with the application and then the configuration of the client for both platform requirements and known incompatible assemblies, and if no errors (thereby qualifying the application), the installer then downloads on demand or as a package of typical functionality.

But, **Belfiore** does not expressly disclose "...a valid combination..." However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, that configuration information 1450 identifying "a valid combination" platform services needed by the software to "qualify" the manifest, describing how the software associated with the manifest 1400 can be used and should behave (See Column 42, lines 37-40) allowing managers to apply policies (Column 42, lines 15-19). The motivation to do so would have been to apply administrator policies to allow for the diverse state and version configurations as taught by **Belfiore** (Column 42, lines 52-57), to facilitate versioning, distribution and interoperability.

In regard to claim **2**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*a first subset of data for modeling said plurality of interactions; and a second subset of data for modeling said plurality of components.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 (1400, 1410, 1420, 1430, 1450 & Column 41, lines 7-25), wherein different layers of isolation for managing software are taught in the context of the code manager manifest, wherein code management primarily concerns abstracting and interactions between operating components, services and applications.

In regard to claim **4**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*utilizing a first set of predefined rules.*" (E.g., see Column 3, lines 33-35), wherein a schema is a set of rules.

In regard to claim **5**, the rejections of base claim **4** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*said first group of data comprising version-identifying data for said plurality of interactions and version range identifying data related to said plurality of components...*" (E.g., see Figure 13 & Column 42, lines 52-61), wherein a range of versions comprising old, new and specific versions.
- "...and each of said first set of predefined rules comprise the version of a particular interaction lying within said version range of a first component and a second component cooperating through said

particular interaction." (E.g., see Figure 13 & Column 42, lines 25-29), wherein a policy setting newer versions (range) is taught.

In regard to claim **8**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "*...wherein said plurality of groups for data comprise a plurality of generic entities for said plurality of components, said plurality of interactions and a software load; wherein said entities comprise predefined numbers; and wherein said first group of data and said second group of data utilizes such generic entities for representing said plurality of components, said plurality of interactions and said software load.*" (E.g., see Figure 3 & Column 14, lines 23-34), wherein a service pre-populates (predefined numbers) of core (generic) types for defining the rules of a modeling components and interactions.

In regard to claim **9**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "*...generic entities comprise attributes and sub-entities.*" (E.g., see Figure 2 & Column 12, lines 55-64), wherein extendible schemas from core schemas (generic sub-entities) comprising attributes and sub-entities are disclosed.

In regard to claim **10**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*stored in accordance with a tree structure.*" (E.g., see Column 29, lines 30-41).

In regard to claim **11**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*a third group of data modeling configuration values for loading a software load as defined in said second group of data.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 & Column 42, lines 37-40), wherein configuration information 1450 identifies data tables and platform services needed by the software, how the software associated with the manifest 1400 can be used or should behave.

In regard to claim **12**, the rejections of base claim **11** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*a second software code, wherein said second software code interacts with said third group of data for verifying that said third group of data define a set of required configuration values.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 & Column 42, lines 25-36), wherein code implements policies (verifications via schema) such that newer versions of a particular software object will be used, wherein a specific version may be specified and implemented upon error with the newer version.

In regard to claim **13**, the rejections of base claim **12** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*generic entities for interactions, with a configuration attribute having an attribute statement; and said second software code reverts to said first group of data for determining said configuration attribute.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 & Column 42, lines 25-36), wherein code implements policies (statements) about attributes value (specific version) by reverting to the component abstraction metadata (first group of data) to determine the configuration attribute.

In regard to claim **14**, the rejections of base claim **13** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*said first, second and third group of data comprise instances of said generic entities for representing said components, said software load and said configuration values...*" (E.g., see Figure 1 & Column 22, lines 7-17), wherein instant data of generic entities (public envelope).
- "...*and said second software code reverts from said third group of data through said second group of data to said first group of data, for determining whether a configuration value is present.*" (E.g., see Figure 1 & Column 22, lines 7-17), wherein instant data of generic entities and schema information in order to capture higher-level semantics and rules which to create derivative events is taught. It is also noted that the schema must revert to the configuration data of the instant data described in relation to claim **13** version rules.

In regard to claim **15**, the rejections of base claim **13** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "*...said generic entities each comprise a final configuration attribute for at least one of said components, said interactions and said software load; and said second software code is responsive to finding an attribute value qualified as final, and nevertheless finding an attribute value downstream in the sense: interaction, component, software load, configuration value for entering an error processing mode.*" (E.g., see Figure 4 & Column 42, lines 25-34), wherein if the final configuration values are incompatible with the (error) software requirements of the software, the code is responsive to resort to the default version value (qualified attribute value).

In regard to claim **17**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "*...determines if a rollback from said configuration update is authorized.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 & Column 42, lines 25-36), wherein a rollback is dictated by the administrator's policy (authorization).

In regard to claim **18**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "*...comprises a current load.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 (1400) & Column 41, lines 38-42), wherein the manifest 1400 may comprise the currently installed software.

In regard to claim **19**, the rejections of base claim **18** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*said current load is at least partially represented in the form of directory data.*" (E.g., see Figure 8 & Column 30, lines 43-49), wherein a directory stores entity information.

In regard to claim **20**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*comprising a fourth software code for implementing a new configuration value in a platform based on said plurality of groups of data.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 (1450) & Column 42, lines 51).

In regard to claim **21**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*a new software load.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 (1400) & Column 41, lines 38-42), wherein the manifest 1400 may comprise the new software load.

In regard to claim **23**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*a sixth software code capable of indicating a state of a component from said plurality of groups of data in response to a request.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 & Column 42, lines 37-51), wherein management code monitors the state to provide developers configuration information.

In regard to claim **24**, the rejections of base claim **23** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*a management service code utilizing said sixth software code.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 & Column 42, lines 37-51), wherein management code monitors the state to provide developers configuration information.

In regard to claim **25**, the rejections of base claim **24** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*local management service code.*" (E.g., see Figure 2 & Column 43, lines 11-17), wherein code management uses the manifest to allow administrators to locate applications locally and distributed.

In regard to claim **26**, the rejections of base claim **24** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*a management agent enabling remove management.*" (E.g., see Figure7 & Column 28, lines 33-43), wherein remote access is taught.

In regard to claim **27**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "...*said tree structure includes a system section comprising said generic entities and said predefined instance of such generic entities.*" (E.g., see Column 13, lines 23-26), wherein a generic system section is taught, which may be pre-populated.

In regard to claim **28**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "*...said first group of data comprises data associated with referencing instances and component assignments.*" (E.g., see Figure 13 & Column 41, line 50 – Column 42, line 4), wherein referencing data associated with manifest instances and components assigned (dependent) to the particular manifest is disclosed.

In regard to claim **29**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses:

- "*...said common software language is a markup language.*" (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 29, lines 1-8), wherein XML engine (812) is disclosed.

In regard to claims **30-34**, this is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, in claims **1, 3-5** and **8**, respectively, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above.

In regard to claim **35**, the rejections of claims **1** and **10**, are incorporated. Furthermore, **Belfiore** discloses a computer readable medium (Figure 1 (155) & Column 28, lines 25-32), wherein instructions to implement the method may be stored.

In regard to claims **36, 38** and **39**, this is a computer readable medium version of the claimed system discussed above, in claims **11, 17** and **23**, respectively, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above.

8. Claims **3, 6, 7** and **22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belfiore in view of Little et al., US 2002/0091990 (hereinafter **Little**).

In regard to claim **3**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. But, **Belfiore** does not expressly disclose "*...a first subset of data for modeling software components; and a second subset of data for modeling hardware components.*" However, **Little** discloses:

- "*...a first subset of data for modeling software components; and a second subset of data for modeling hardware components.*" (E.g., see Figure 1 + 2 & paragraph [0007]), wherein architectural models and IDL models are taught. See paragraph [0385], wherein hardware components are taught.

Belfiore and **Little** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, a distributed application modeling system. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine **Little's** modeling concepts with **Belfiore's** modeling. The motivation to do so would have been to extend the system definition type to include hardware assembly as suggested by **Belfiore** (See Column 13, lines 22-25) to define system related information and configurations. Additionally, **Little's** teaching (See page 6, paragraph [0125]) of modeling to promote better understanding of requirements would have suggested incorporating **Little's** modeling teachings into **Belfiore's** observable abstraction of informational requirements of software components to make good decisions (Column 4, lines 15-24).

In regard to claim **6**, the rejections of base claim **5** are incorporated. But **Belfiore** does not expressly disclose "*...direction interaction, wherein each direction interaction is between a server component providing one of said plurality of interfaces and a client component utilizing said one of said plurality of interfaces.*" However, **Little** discloses:

- "*...data defines a plurality of direction interaction, wherein each direction interaction is between a server component providing one of said plurality of interfaces and a client component utilizing said one of said plurality of interfaces.*" (E.g., see Figure 26 & paragraph [252]), wherein the distribution between a server and client are illustrated with a direction and interface implementation for the corresponding skeletons and stubs for the distribution adapter class and methods.

In regard to claim **7**, the rejections of base claim **6** are incorporated. In regard to claim **6**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. But **Belfiore** and **Little** do not expressly disclose "*...generic "provide" and "use" entities ...verifying that the intersection of their respective "provide" and "use" version ranges is not nil.*" However, **Belfiore** discloses providing the versioning instance and range as discussed above in regard to claim **5** and furthermore extending an event schema to allow backward versioning (version range) to the generic core schemas (See Column 22, lines 28-37) to validate requirements of the software (verifying no empty), thereby performing the equivalent function of verifying a version value in a version range using generic "provide" and "use" entities to provide a foundation for interaction and collaboration on servers (See **Belfiore**, Column 12, lines 47-52).

In regard to claim **22**, the rejections of base claim **21** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Little** discloses:

- "*...a fifth software code, capable of building a software load image implementing said new software load based on said plurality of groups of data and on a package file.*" (E.g., see page 2, paragraph [0017]), wherein BEA builder is disclosed.

9. Claims **16** and **37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belfiore in view of Little and further in view of Baliff et al., US 7,020,677 (hereinafter **Baliff**).

In regard to claim **16**, the rejections of base claim **11** are incorporated. But **Belfiore** and **Little** do not expressly disclose "*...generic "provide" and "use" entities ...verifying that the intersection of their respective "provide" and "use" version ranges is not nil.*" However, **Baliff** discloses:

- "*...a fourth set of data comprising platform update data for designating a configuration update having an update level...*" (E.g., see Figure 1 & Column 9, lines 1-4), wherein the TUXXONFIG level is a configuration file with a level.
- "*...and a thirds software code determines if a transition to said configuration update is authorized.*" (E.g., see Figure 1 & Column 9, lines 1-4), wherein the TUXCONFIG level is verified.

Belfiore, Little and **Baliff** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, a configuring a distributed application system. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine **Baliff's** configuration update technique with **Belfiore** and **Little's** modeling. The motivation to do so was suggested by **Belfiore's** disclosure of using the BEA Configuration Expert to administer a set of servers as an entity providing related services to clients via the TUXCONFIG file (See Page 3, paragraph [0047])

In regard to claim **37**, this is a computer readable medium version of the claimed system discussed above, in claim **16**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in

the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

10. Claims **1-39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kampe et al., US 6,854,069 (hereinafter **Kampe**).

In regard to claim **1**, **Kampe** discloses:

- "*A computer system comprising: a plurality of groups of data in a common software language, wherein each group of data comprises; a first group of data modeling a plurality of components and a plurality of interactions between said plurality of components...*" (E.g., see Figure 2 & Column 6, lines 12-19), wherein a method for representing hardware and software via components is disclosed.
- "*...a second group of data modeling a software load of said plurality of components and said plurality of interactions between said plurality of components...*" (E.g., see Figure 4 & Column 7, lines 9-14), wherein interfaces modeling interactions/relationships between components is disclosed.
- "*...and a first software code interacting with said plurality of groups of data for qualifying said second subset of data as defining a valid combination of said plurality of components.*" (E.g., see Figure 6 & Column 7, lines 47-59), wherein management agents allow determine whether or not the respective components are suitable for the respective device and/or components.

In regard to claim **2**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "*...a first subset of data for modeling said plurality of interactions; and a second subset of data for modeling said plurality of components.*" (E.g., see Figure 2 & Column 6, lines 12-19), wherein a method for representing software and interfaces via components is disclosed.

In regard to claim **3**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "*...a first subset of data for modeling software components; and a second subset of data for modeling hardware components.*" (E.g., see Figure 2 & Column 6, lines 12-19), wherein a method for representing hardware and software via components is disclosed.

In regard to claim **4**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "*...said first software code interacts with said plurality of groups of data utilizing a first set of predefined rules.*" (E.g., see Figure 6 & Column 7, lines 47-59), wherein component role and instance manager implement components.

In regard to claim **5**, the rejections of base claim **4** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "*...said first group of data comprising version-identifying data for said plurality of interactions and version range identifying data related to*

said plurality of components..." (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 18, lines 41-53), wherein version range identifying data related to components is taught.

- "*...and each of said first set of predefined rules comprise the version of a particular interaction lying within said version range of a first component and a second component cooperating through said particular interaction."* (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 18, lines 41-53), wherein version range identifying data related to components is taught.

In regard to claim **6**, the rejections of base claim **5** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "*...data defines a plurality of direction interaction, wherein each direction interaction is between a server component providing one of said plurality of interfaces and a client component utilizing said one of said plurality of interfaces.*" (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 18, lines 41-43), wherein interfaces are managed by version range for servers/client provide and use relationship.

In regard to claim **7**, the rejections of base claim **6** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "*...said first set of data comprises generic "provide" and "use" entities each having a version range identifying attribute, with instance of said "provide" and "use" entities attached to said server component and client component with values of said version range identifying attribute,*

respectively..." (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 18, lines 43-53), wherein interfaces include type and include ranges.

- "*...and said first predefined rules comprise: initially verifying that said first group of data comprise an interaction for each version value in each instantiated version range; and for a given pair of sever component and client component, verifying that the intersection of their respective "provide" and "use" version ranges is not nil.*" (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 18, lines 41-43), wherein interfaces are managed by version range for servers/client provide and use relationship.

In regard to claim **8**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "*...wherein said plurality of groups for data comprise a plurality of generic entities for said plurality of components, said plurality of interactions and a software load; wherein said entities comprise predefined numbers; and wherein said first group of data and said second group of data utilizes such generic entities for representing said plurality of components, said plurality of interactions and said software load.*" (E.g., see Figure 6 & Column 7, lines 47-55), wherein standard components which can be configured are disclosed.

In regard to claim **9**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*generic entities comprise attributes and sub-entities.*" (E.g., see Figure 6 & Column 7, lines 47-55), wherein standard components comprising attributes and sub-entities which can be configured are disclosed.

In regard to claim **10**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*stored in accordance with a tree structure.*" (E.g., see Figure 9 & Column 15, lines 7-21), wherein searchable tree with configuration values can be searched and returned.

In regard to claim **11**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*a third group of data modeling configuration values for loading a software load as defined in said second group of data.*" (E.g., see Figure 9 & Column 15, lines 7-21), wherein searchable tree with configuration values can be searched and returned.

In regard to claim **12**, the rejections of base claim **11** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*a second software code, wherein said second software code interacts with said third group of data for verifying that said third group of data define a set of required configuration values.*" (E.g., see Figure 6 & Column 7, lines 47-59), wherein component role and instance manager implement components.

In regard to claim **13**, the rejections of base claim **12** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "*...generic entities for interactions, with a configuration attribute having an attribute statement; and said second software code reverts to said first group of data for determining said configuration attribute.*" (E.g., see Figure 9 & Column 14, lines 23-30), wherein the configuration repository and corresponding components is disclosed.

In regard to claim **14**, the rejections of base claim **13** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "*...said generic entities having a configuration value attribute; said first, second and third group of data comprise instances of said generic entities for representing said components, said software load and said configuration values...*" (E.g., see Figure 9 & Column 14, lines 47-56), wherein configuration attributes represent components and their relationships.
- "*...and said second software code reverts from said third group of data through said second group of data to said first group of data, for determining whether a configuration value is present.*" (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 18, lines 41-43), wherein interfaces are managed by version range ensuring proper versions.

In regard to claim **15**, the rejections of base claim **13** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*said generic entities each comprise a final configuration attribute for at least one of said components, said interactions and said software load; and said second software code is responsive to finding an attribute value qualified as final, and nevertheless finding an attribute value downstream in the sense: interaction, component, software load, configuration value for entering an error processing mode.*" ." (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 19, lines 23-41 + Figure 6 (605)), wherein the error correlator is disclosed.

In regard to claim **16**, the rejections of base claim **11** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*a fourth set of data comprising platform update data for designating a configuration update having an update level...*" (E.g., see Figure 9 & Column 15, lines 22-30), wherein configuration updates are disclosed comprising versions (levels).
- "...*and a thirds software code determines if a transition to said configuration update is authorized.*" (E.g., see Figure 10 & Column 18, lines 41-43), wherein updates are managed by ensuring proper versions.

In regard to claim **17**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*determines if a rollback from said configuration update is authorized.*" (E.g., see Figure 6 & Column 19, lines 23-41), wherein a policy for falling back on the previous release is taught.

In regard to claim **18**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*comprises a current load.*" (E.g., see Figure 2 & Column 20, lines 42-50), wherein management for a collection of software objects is disclosed.

In regard to claim **19**, the rejections of base claim **18** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*said current load is at least partially represented in the form of directory data.*" (E.g., see Figure 9 & Column 15, lines 7-21), wherein searchable tree with configuration values can be searched and returned.

In regard to claim **20**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*comprising a fourth software code for implementing a new configuration value in a platform based on said plurality of groups of data.*" (E.g., see Figure 11 & Column 15, lines 22-30), wherein configuration updates are implemented.

In regard to claim **21**, the rejections of base claim **16** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*a new software load.*" (E.g., see Figure 2 & Column 20, lines 42-50).

In regard to claim **22**, the rejections of base claim **21** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*a fifth software code, capable of building a software load image implementing said new software load based on said plurality of groups of data and on a package file.*" (E.g., see Figure 6 & Column 17, lines 60-67), wherein software loads are packaged.

In regard to claim **23**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*a sixth software code capable of indicating a state of a component from said plurality of groups of data in response to a request.*" (E.g., see Figure 11 & Column 20-, lines 42-50),component manager.

In regard to claim **24** and **25, Kampe** discloses:

- "...*local management service code.*" (E.g., see Figure 2 & Column 20, lines 42-50), wherein management for a collection of software objects is disclosed

In regard to claim **26**, the rejections of base claim **24** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*a management agent enabling remove management.*" (E.g., see Figure 2 (204), distributed services.

In regard to claim **27**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*said tree structure includes a system section comprising said generic entities and said predefined instance of such generic entities.*" (E.g., see Figure 9 & Column 15, lines 7-21), wherein searchable tree with standard/generic entities may contain predefined instance data.

In regard to claim **28**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*said first group of data comprises data associated with referencing instances and component assignments.*" (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 11, lines 40-45), wherein referencing component re-assignments is taught.

In regard to claim **29**, the rejections of base claim **1** are incorporated. Furthermore, **Kampe** discloses:

- "...*said common software language is a markup language.*" (E.g., see Figure 11 & Column 20, line 17), wherein XML is disclosed.

In regard to claims **30-34**, this is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, in claims **1, 3-5** and **8**, respectively, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above.

In regard to claim **35**, the rejections of claims **1** and **10**, are incorporated.

In regard to claims **36-39**, this is a computer readable medium version of the claimed system discussed above, in claims **11, 16, 17** and **23**, respectively, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Romano whose telephone number is (571) 272-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JJR

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER